

The Tribune.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

BY MAIL—IN ADVANCE—POSTAGE PREPAID.
Daily Edition, one year. \$12.00
Sunday Edition: Literary and Religious
Saturday Edition, twelve pages. \$2.00
Tuesday, one year. \$12.00
Wednesday, one year. \$12.00

WEEKLY EDITION, POSTPAID.
One copy. \$1.00
Ten copies sent free.
Post-office address in full, including State and County.

Remittances may be made either by draft, express, Post-Office money-order, or by mail.

TERMS TO CITY SUBSCRIBERS.
Daily, delivered, Sunday excepted, 20 cents per week.
Tuesday, delivered, Sunday included, 30 cents per week.
Address: THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE, 100 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
Orders for delivery of THE TRIBUNE at Evansville, Englewood, and Hyde Park left in the counting-room will receive immediate attention.

TRIBUNE BRANCH OFFICES.

The CHICAGO TRIBUNE has established branch offices for the receipt of subscriptions and advertisements as follows:

NEW YORK—Room 20 Tribune Building, F. T. McFARLANE, Manager.
PARIS, France—No. 10 Rue de la Grange-Bateliere.
M. MAHLER, Agent.
LONDON—America Exchange, 44 Strand.
HENRY F. GILLOU, Agent.
SAN FRANCISCO, Cal.—Palace Hotel.

AMUSEMENTS.

McVicker's Theatre.
Madison street, between Dearborn and State.
"Uncle Tom's Cabin." Afternoon and evening.

Hooley's Theatre.
Randolph street, between Clark and Lake.
Union Square Theatre Company. "The Celebrated Case." Afternoon and evening.

Harvey's Theatre.
Monroe street, corner of Dearborn. Adah Richmon's Opera House Company. "Chow Chow." Afternoon and evening.

Hershey Music Hall.
Madison street, opposite McVicker's Theatre. The Midgates.

SOCIETY MEETINGS.

BLAINE LODGE, NO. 271, A. F. & A. M.—Stated Communication this (Wednesday) evening, at 8 o'clock, Hall to Monday evening, will be held.

GEORGE GARDNER, W. M.

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 26, 1878.

Greenbacks at the New York Stock Exchange yesterday closed at 299.

Crop reports collected in St. Paul, from numerous localities in Minnesota and Wisconsin, represent that the outlook for wheat in Minnesota is even better than it was last year, both as to acreage and yield.

It is now discovered that TILDEN is at the bottom of the HEWITT-WATKINS unpleasantry, and that the charges of dishonesty against HEWITT are inspired by the venerable scion of Gramercy Park, who has adopted this vicious method of avenging himself for what he has been led to believe was a betrayal of his interests upon HEWITT's part in connection with the Electoral dispute. HEWITT advanced \$100,000 toward the campaign expense, and TILDEN is now repaying it in installments, as per HEWITT's open letter "of even date."

GORDON HENDRICKS never made a shrewd jump from off the fence he is so fond of straddling when he made up his mind that the time had arrived to sit squarely down on the investigation instituted by TILDEN, as an aid to his aspirations in 1880. He is represented as having expressed to an interviewer "great disappointment" at the achievements of the POTTER Committee, an expression which does not necessarily imply that GO. HENDRICKS ever had any expectation that the frauds would result advantageously to the Democratic party. He now considers it a dismal failure, and has no hesitation in saying it ought never to have been undertaken.

Considerable chagrin was felt among the House Democrats at the development of a prima facie case of corruption in the engrossment of the Sundry Civil Bill, in which the law providing for the continuance of the labor of the Hot Springs Commission was omitted from the bill. It is of importance that the work of the Commission should not fall through on account of this evident conspiracy among the engrossing clerks of the House to defeat the law, and the members of the Conference Committee of both Houses and both parties have united in a request that the President direct the Commission to take the necessary measures to protect all parties in their rights and preserve the present status, the request being accompanied by a pledge that the omitted law will be re-enacted at the winter session of Congress, and an order to this effect has been issued by the Secretary of the Interior.

Another victory for the octolators of the community over the selfish greed of the stock-makers who refuse to introduce supplies for deodorizing the noxious vapors which the southwest wind brings is recorded in a decision of the Illinois Supreme Court filed on Monday last. A case on appeal was taken up by the Chicago Packing & Provision Company for the purpose of testing the power of the city authorities to impose a license upon rendering or packing houses within one mile of the city limits, and the decision of the Court affirms the right of the city to impose such regulations by ordinance. Under the decision the municipal authorities can deal with a stock-factory just as they deal with a disorderly saloon—that is, revoke the license if the evil complained of is not abated, and impose a heavy fine upon establishments which persist in doing business after their licenses have been revoked. The ruling of the Supreme Court, together with the recent convictions of stock men in the Criminal Court, promises a sure remedy for the outrageous infliction endured by the people of Chicago these many years.

Any expectation by the Democrats of aid and comfort through the testimony of ex-Marshall PRITZK, of Louisiana, was speedily dispelled upon the appearance of that gentleman before the House Committee yesterday. So far from corroborating ANDERSON in any essential particular, he filed a still greater load of infamy upon that already overburdened felon. He testified that ANDERSON's movements in New Orleans were such as to excite the suspicion that he was negotiating for a "sell-out" to the Democrats, and that a close watch was accordingly kept on ANDERSON's movements. It was on this account that great care was taken to see that ANDERSON's protest in reference to intimidation and violence in East Feliciana was drawn up in legal form, and duly sworn to, and the statement of the case of the late execution was, that the certainty of punishment had more power in deterring men from crime than any number of statutes. The law defines the crime, and prescribes the penalty; but this of itself does not deter men from crime so long as in nine cases out of ten the guilty man escapes punishment. If the probabilities of punishment

resembled those of the lottery, the chances of being drawn out of his lot would be great enough to rob the law of its terror; but when the number of persons committing murder who are executed does not exceed one in ten of those who are notoriously guilty, the uncertainty of the death-penalty offers to the criminal an invitation to gratify his deadly or malignant purpose in defiance of that personal security and safety which the law against murder is intended to afford. We are not discussing any particular case; the fact we have mentioned is notorious. Nor are we suggesting that our judicial or other officers are, however remotely, corrupt or unduly influenced by the use of money or other inducements to falter in the performance of their duty. But the execution of the laws for the punishment of crime is weak, and is so weak and so uncertain that crime has such a contempt for the law that it is never deterred by the statute-book.

The conviction and execution of two men for murder, however calculated to disabuse the popular impression that the law cannot be enforced, and the law as rigidly enforced in all other cases, so that it shall be established as a moral certainty that whoever commits murder in this county shall be hanged, and that juries, prosecutors, courts, and executives will show the same firmness and fidelity in the interest of justice as have been shown in these late cases. Any relaxation of justice, any loose administration of the law in the future, will naturally be accepted as a confirmation of the theory that these men were hanged because they had no money with which to defuse the ends of justice.

The weakness in the execution of the criminal law is due to many causes, and first it is due to the construction of the law which excludes intelligence from the jury, and commits the trial of criminals to stupid ignorance. The law of criminal procedure is abused to render conviction for crime as nearly impossible as human ingenuity can devise. In the first place, it provides for delay. The longer the delay the less certain is the testimony, and less certain the attendance of witnesses, whom you have taken. From a long and intimate acquaintance with Gov. HAYES, we know that he makes no secret of his methods and practices, and that you will be provided for as soon after 4th of March as may be practicable, and after that date you will be provided for as soon as you can get to the penitentiary, to let you know, Louisiana, should you deem it necessary. Very truly yours,

JOHN JENKS.

Since Mrs. JENKS has given her testimony, it has become very certain that Secretary SHERMAN never wrote this letter, and a good many people wonder that he did not give a more explicit denial of the authorship at the time he appeared before the Committee. Secretary SHERMAN himself explains this fully and satisfactorily. He says that his denial was as emphatic as any honest man, anxious to tell nothing but the truth, could have given under the circumstances. When he appeared before the Committee, he was ignorant of what ANDERSON had testified; he was confronted with the fact that the Democrats claimed to have the original letter, or at least photographic copies thereof, which would amount to the same thing; he found in the letter some things he would naturally have said; he had the strongest conviction that he never wrote any such letter, and so expressed himself, but would not go further under oath at that time. It was a careful and proper position to take, and that is what will be understood by men of affairs.

But suppose it had turned out that Mr. SHERMAN had written the very letter which the Democrats have been so anxious to prove upon him? Does a careful reading of the document, addressed to two men who, as SHERMAN thought, were anxious to do their duty but feared for their lives if they did it, indicate any corrupt motive on the part of the writer, any connivance at fraud, or any attempt at bribery? Isn't it a letter that SHERMAN might properly have written under the circumstances? There are just two points in the letter. In the first place, it urges these two men "to stand firm in the position they had taken." That is, they had sworn to a condition of things in East and West Feliciana which SHERMAN believed to be true, and which he now says he can prove to be true. Was it strange or wrong that he should urge them to adhere to the truth in spite of threats or bribes? In the next place, he expressed the opinion that the President would provide for them "in such manner as will enable you both to leave Louisiana, should you deem it necessary;" that is, if this protest placed their lives in danger or brought down upon them the wrath of the bulldozers to an extent which should prevent them from earning a living for themselves and their families here in Louisiana, then he would guarantee that they should be provided for elsewhere. We should say that it would be cruel to refuse them Government support under such circumstances, and Mr. SHERMAN would have judged Mr. HAYES harshly if he had not dared to promise this much in case he should fail to provide for them elsewhere; the other the two (ANDERSON) forfeited his claim for provision by becoming an adventurer, black-mailer, and forger, or revealing his character if he had always been such a man.

Whether Mrs. JENKS, WALTER ANDERSON, or anybody else wrote this letter, it would fail in its purpose of convicting Secretary SHERMAN of dishonorable action, even if his alleged authorship thereof had not been disproved. Now it is time, as Secretary SHERMAN says, either for this Committee to disband or to enter upon the task of proving the two Felicianas elections to have been free and fair; and, in this attempt, Secretary SHERMAN is ready to confront them.

PUNISHMENT FOR CRIME.

We print a letter this morning commenting upon some remarks made in this paper upon the necessity and justice of impartially enforcing the law for the punishment of crime. The popular impression among the friends of the two young men who suffered the death-penalty last week was, that if the men had money they would never have been executed, and that impression seems to prevail among large portions of the community who are not properly to be classed as friends of criminals. The question of the righteousness of the punishment is ignored, and the question of money or no money is regarded as determining whether crime shall be punished as the law directs, or whether crime shall go unpunished. No more unfortunate impression could exist. That it does exist, and especially among those contemplating crime, is a direct encouragement to crime by holding out the promise that exemption from punishment is obtainable for a pecuniary consideration. It is almost useless to contend upon such a demoralizing public opinion that crime is punished or not punished according to the means of the criminal if purchase can be had for a price.

The point made by Mr. TANQUEW in the case of the late execution was, that the certainty of punishment had more power in deterring men from crime than any number of statutes. The law defines the crime, and prescribes the penalty; but this of itself does not deter men from crime so long as in nine cases out of ten the guilty man escapes punishment.

With the Democrats, Mr. TILDEN is the real issue. TILDEN is the self-appointed Democratic candidate for the Presidency in 1880. There was some vigorous opposition in New York State to his nomination in

robbed Judge LARSEN's narrative of the offer by the Democrats of \$100,000 to induce him to withdraw his vote as a Hayes Elector. On this whole, PITTEN's testimony was a wretched blot on the Democratic cause.

Probably no State in the Union presents a more interesting aspect at the present moment from the political standpoint than the neighboring State of Wisconsin, and we print this morning a concise and intelligent review of the situation from our well-known Milwaukee correspondent. The hostility of Senator HOWE to the President's policy seems to be shared to a limited extent by every Wisconsin Republican Congressman, including Senator CAMERON, and this feeling, according to our correspondent, is sympathized with by the rank and file of the party. And yet there is a strong party in the State, led by Gov. SARAS and HORACE TILDEN, Chairman of the Republican State Central Committee, who are warm adherents of Mr. HAYES, and will lend him a cordial and energetic support. Under these circumstances, the election of a United States Senator next winter is a place of Senator HOWE is invested with uncommon interest, and this interest is considerably augmented by the number and prominence of the Senatorial candidates already in training for the race.

THE SO-CALLED SHERMAN LETTER.
Mr. CAPT. JENKS' testimony before the POTTER-BUTLER Committee relates almost entirely to the Sherman Letter, and as that apocryphal document was the very basis of their investigation we reproduce it for further little consideration.

New Orleans, June 26, 1878.—Messrs. D. A. Webber and James E. Anderson—GENTLEMEN:

Your note of date has just been received. We enclose a copy of the letter you desire us to accompany you, or the country at large can ever forget the obligations under which you will have placed us. Your kind services to us are acknowledged by us, and your name is dear to us.

Very truly yours,

JOHN JENKS.

Since Mrs. JENKS has given her testimony, it has become very certain that Secretary SHERMAN never wrote this letter, and a good many people wonder that he did not give a more explicit denial of the authorship at the time he appeared before the Committee. Secretary SHERMAN himself explains this fully and satisfactorily. He says that his denial was as emphatic as any honest man, anxious to tell nothing but the truth, could have given under the circumstances. When he appeared before the Committee, he was ignorant of what ANDERSON had testified; he was confronted with the fact that the Democrats claimed to have the original letter, or at least photographic copies thereof, which would amount to the same thing; he found in the letter some things he would naturally have said; he had the strongest conviction that he never wrote any such letter, and so expressed himself, but would not go further under oath at that time. It was a careful and proper position to take, and that is what will be understood by men of affairs.

But suppose it had turned out that Mr. SHERMAN had written the very letter which the Democrats have been so anxious to prove upon him? Does a careful reading of the document, addressed to two men who, as SHERMAN thought, were anxious to do their duty but feared for their lives if they did it, indicate any corrupt motive on the part of the writer, any connivance at fraud, or any attempt at bribery? Isn't it a letter that SHERMAN might properly have written under the circumstances? There are just two points in the letter. In the first place, it urges these two men "to stand firm in the position they had taken." That is, they had sworn to a condition of things in East and West Feliciana which SHERMAN believed to be true, and which he now says he can prove to be true. Was it strange or wrong that he should urge them to adhere to the truth in spite of threats or bribes? In the next place, he expressed the opinion that the President would provide for them "in such manner as will enable you both to leave Louisiana, should you deem it necessary;" that is, if this protest placed their lives in danger or brought down upon them the wrath of the bulldozers to an extent which should prevent them from earning a living for themselves and their families here in Louisiana, then he would guarantee that they should be provided for elsewhere. We should say that it would be cruel to refuse them Government support under such circumstances, and Mr. SHERMAN would have judged Mr. HAYES harshly if he had not dared to promise this much in case he should fail to provide for them elsewhere; the other the two (ANDERSON) forfeited his claim for provision by becoming an adventurer, black-mailer, and forger, or revealing his character if he had always been such a man.

But suppose it had turned out that Mr. SHERMAN had written the very letter which the Democrats have been so anxious to prove upon him? Does a careful reading of the document, addressed to two men who, as SHERMAN thought, were anxious to do their duty but feared for their lives if they did it, indicate any corrupt motive on the part of the writer, any connivance at fraud, or any attempt at bribery? Isn't it a letter that SHERMAN might properly have written under the circumstances? There are just two points in the letter. In the first place, it urges these two men "to stand firm in the position they had taken." That is, they had sworn to a condition of things in East and West Feliciana which SHERMAN believed to be true, and which he now says he can prove to be true. Was it strange or wrong that he should urge them to adhere to the truth in spite of threats or bribes? In the next place, he expressed the opinion that the President would provide for them "in such manner as will enable you both to leave Louisiana, should you deem it necessary;" that is, if this protest placed their lives in danger or brought down upon them the wrath of the bulldozers to an extent which should prevent them from earning a living for themselves and their families here in Louisiana, then he would guarantee that they should be provided for elsewhere. We should say that it would be cruel to refuse them Government support under such circumstances, and Mr. SHERMAN would have judged Mr. HAYES harshly if he had not dared to promise this much in case he should fail to provide for them elsewhere; the other the two (ANDERSON) forfeited his claim for provision by becoming an adventurer, black-mailer, and forger, or revealing his character if he had always been such a man.

Whether Mrs. JENKS, WALTER ANDERSON, or anybody else wrote this letter, it would fail in its purpose of convicting Secretary SHERMAN of dishonorable action, even if his alleged authorship thereof had not been disproved. Now it is time, as Secretary SHERMAN says, either for this Committee to disband or to enter upon the task of proving the two Felicianas elections to have been free and fair; and, in this attempt, Secretary SHERMAN is ready to confront them.

PUNISHMENT FOR CRIME.

We print a letter this morning commenting upon some remarks made in this paper upon the necessity and justice of impartially enforcing the law for the punishment of crime. The Courts which encourage and foster such trifling actually encourage crime by affording the means of escape from its legal punishment.

The law to punish crime has for its object the protection of society; that is, to prevent the commission of crimes and to secure a non-agreement of some or another to commit a crime.

It is now discovered that TILDEN is at the bottom of the HEWITT-WATKINS unpleasantry, and that the charges of dishonesty against HEWITT are inspired by the venerable scion of Gramercy Park, who has adopted this vicious method of avenging himself for what he has been led to believe was a betrayal of his interests upon HEWITT's part in connection with the Electoral dispute. HEWITT advanced \$100,000 toward the campaign expense, and TILDEN is now repaying it in installments, as per HEWITT's open letter "of even date."

GORDON HENDRICKS never made a shrewd jump from off the fence he is so fond of straddling when he made up his mind that the time had arrived to sit squarely down on the investigation instituted by TILDEN, as an aid to his aspirations in 1880. He is represented as having expressed to an interviewer "great disappointment" at the achievements of the POTTER Committee, an expression which does not necessarily imply that GO. HENDRICKS ever had any expectation that the frauds would result advantageously to the Democratic party. He now considers it a dismal failure, and has no hesitation in saying it ought never to have been undertaken.

Considerable chagrin was felt among the House Democrats at the development of a prima facie case of corruption in the engrossment of the Sundry Civil Bill, in which the law providing for the continuance of the labor of the Hot Springs Commission was omitted from the bill. It is of importance that the work of the Commission should not fall through on account of this evident conspiracy among the engrossing clerks of the House to defeat the law, and the members of the Conference Committee of both Houses and both parties have united in a request that the President direct the Commission to take the necessary measures to protect all parties in their rights and preserve the present status, the request being accompanied by a pledge that the omitted law will be re-enacted at the winter session of Congress, and an order to this effect has been issued by the Secretary of the Interior.

Another victory for the octolators of the community over the selfish greed of the stock-makers who refuse to introduce supplies for deodorizing the noxious vapors which the southwest wind brings is recorded in a decision of the Illinois Supreme Court filed on Monday last. A case on appeal was taken up by the Chicago Packing & Provision Company for the purpose of testing the power of the city authorities to impose a license upon rendering or packing houses within one mile of the city limits, and the decision of the Court affirms the right of the city to impose such regulations by ordinance. Under the decision the municipal authorities can deal with a stock-factory just as they deal with a disorderly saloon—that is, revoke the license if the evil complained of is not abated, and impose a heavy fine upon establishments which persist in doing business after their licenses have been revoked. The ruling of the Supreme Court, together with the recent convictions of stock men in the Criminal Court, promises a sure remedy for the outrageous infliction endured by the people of Chicago these many years.

Any expectation by the Democrats of aid and comfort through the testimony of ex-

MARSHAL PRITZK, of Louisiana, was speedily dispelled upon the appearance of that gentleman before the House Committee yesterday. So far from corroborating ANDERSON in any essential particular, he filed a still greater load of infamy upon that already overburdened felon. He testified that ANDERSON's movements in New Orleans were such as to excite the suspicion that he was negotiating for a "sell-out" to the Democrats, and that a close watch was accordingly kept on ANDERSON's movements. It was on this account that great care was taken to see that ANDERSON's protest in reference to intimidation and violence in East Feliciana was drawn up in legal form, and duly sworn to, and the statement of the case of the late execution was, that the certainty of punishment had more power in deterring men from crime than any number of statutes. The law defines the crime, and prescribes the penalty; but this of itself does not deter men from crime so long as in nine cases out of ten the guilty man escapes punishment.

1876, and this opposition has gathered strength in the Democratic jungle that has grown out of his defeat. The TILDEN faction demand his renomination on the ground that he was defrauded of the seat after having fairly bought and paid for it. The anti-TILDEN faction opposes his nomination on the ground that he was responsible for the defeat in 1876. Local dissensions in the party increase the friction strife in New York State. Mr. TILDEN himself appreciates the necessity of beginning his campaign at once. The New York *Mercury*, a Democratic organ, announces that he is disposing of his large interest in the New York Elevated Railway (held in the name of his nephew, the somewhat notorious PERLON), and otherwise arranging his private affairs, so that he may devote all his time and money to his political interests. He will begin the work in his own State, and endeavor to reconcile some of the leading Democratic politicians who are now opposed to him. It is at this point that the question of holding a State Convention becomes important. The majority of the present State Committee is opposed to TILDEN, and therefore refuse to call a State Convention. Their protest is that he is a useless expense and

